

DIAGNOSIS AND MANAGEMENT OF DENTAL CARIES

Clinical Diagnosis of Dental Caries: North American Perspective.

Stephen F. Rosenstiel, BDS, MSD

Correspondance:

Stephen F. Rosenstiel, BDS, MSD
Professor, Restorative Dentistry
The Ohio State University College of Dentistry
305 W 12th Avenue
PO Box 182357
Columbus OH 43218-2357
Phone (614) 292-0880
Fax: (614) 292-9422
E-mail rosenstiel.1@osu.edu

The complete version of this paper can be viewed at: <http://www.nidcr.nih.gov/news/consensus.asp>

Abstract:

This paper summarizes current trends in the clinical diagnosis of occlusal caries in response to the RTI/UNC review and reflects the dilemma felt by many dentists who understand the difficulty in accurately assessing the extent and activity of pit and fissure caries in many of their patients. They are unsure if they should be aggressive in instrumenting suspicious lesions and provide small restorations, some of which may not be indicated. Alternatively should they wait until signs are more clear-cut and provide larger restorations? The advantage of practicing dentists is discussed who obtain immediate false-positive feedback when they instrument a tooth with no clinical caries and false-negative feedback when a recall patient exhibits progression of an equivocal lesion. They should be encouraged to use this feedback as part of their diagnostic procedure and explain to their patients the difficulty of providing an accurate and precise diagnosis with existing tests.

Keywords: occlusal caries, pits and fissures, caries management, hidden caries, caries diagnosis

This paper summarizes current trends in the clinical diagnosis of pit and fissure caries from the perspective of North American dentists in response to the RTI review document “Diagnosis and Management of Dental Caries”. The paper reflects the dilemma felt by many dentists who understand the difficulty in accurately assessing the extent and activity of pit and fissure caries in many of their patients. They are unsure if they should be aggressive in instrumenting suspicious lesions and provide small restorations, some of which may not be indicated. Alternatively should they wait until signs are more clear-cut and provide larger restorations?

CARIES DIAGNOSIS

The most common methods among US dentists for the clinical diagnosis of pit and fissure caries are visual/tactile and visual inspection aided by radiographs.¹ There is also considerable interest in commercially available innovative diagnostic systems such as laser fluorescence.² One commercially available product (Diagnodent, KaVo Dental GmbH, Germany) has been reported to be used by 20 percent of Canadian dentists two years after its introduction;³ this product was introduced to the US market Spring 2000. It has been heavily promoted since and interest in such, relative expensive, devices among practicing dentists reflects their concern as to the accuracy of current diagnostic methods. The RTI review concluded that the available evidence describing the validity of diagnostic methods is *poor* and most US dentists would probably agree, although many probably overestimate their diagnostic abilities. However, this rating may have been adversely affected by the reviewers’ decision to exclude non English-language publications. This will underestimate the body of evidence and may be a

significant omission because many of the innovative diagnostic systems have been developed and evaluated by researchers in non-English speaking countries.⁴ A second limitation of the report is the requirement for histological validation of caries status. While ensuring a robust gold standard, this requirement presents a serious limitation for *in vivo* studies of permanent teeth. As the report's authors point out, it effectively limits the validity of *in vivo* studies to those on third molars and first premolars and the fissure pattern and caries presentation of these teeth may not apply to other, clinically more significant, permanent teeth. Excluded from the report is useful work where investigators "dissect" the carious lesion to identify false positives.^{5,6}

In consideration of this discussion, dental educators should emphasize to students and practitioners that current techniques have significant limitations and the tests should be interpreted with such knowledge.⁷ This can easily be demonstrated by showing students examples of teeth with clinically similar appearance but with different degrees of caries penetration. Overall, the probability is high that North American dentists have inaccurate beliefs regarding sensitivity and specificity of their occlusal caries identification techniques causing them to overestimate their ability to diagnose correctly.

THE CLINICAL DILEMMA

Dentists often comment about the increasing difficulty of diagnosing pit and fissure caries in permanent posterior teeth citing examples of so-called “hidden” lesions.⁸ They are unclear when to intervene and can find no unequivocal clinical guidelines as to the management of stained pits and fissures.⁹ Indeed some continuing education speakers currently advocate instrumentation of *all* stained fissures. A recent web-based study of over 400 dentists has confirmed the difficulty in diagnosing stained occlusal fissures based on the visual appearance alone.¹⁰ The webpage included forms to collect responses to the question “occlusal caries into dentin?” for each tooth image (Figure 1). The mean correct diagnosis was 57 percent. Sensitivity was 83 percent; specificity was 46 percent, similar values to published clinical studies with similar lesions.^{11,12} It was concluded that web-based evaluations of stained occlusal fissures yielded diagnoses that had moderately high sensitivity and low specificity. If these judgements had been pursued clinically, they would result in a large number of unneeded restorative interventions.

Practicing dentists are aware of the choice between restorative intervention with the risk of over treatment and “watchful waiting” with the risk of supervised neglect. Most US dentists appreciate that the penalty for over treatment is considerably less than for under treatment (Table 1). Financial rewards aside, contemporary restorative techniques, such as air-abrasion and adhesive restorative materials, permit very selective removal of only diseased or structurally compromised tissue.¹³ These techniques are used to provide minimally sized, tooth-colored, preventive resin restorations^{14,15} and have become very popular in contemporary US dental practice, with dentists being increasingly urged to intervene earlier with the new techniques.¹⁶ Recent amendments to the American Dental Association procedure

codes reflect changes in the use of these restorations, for example not permitting a dentist for using the “preventive resin restoration” code unless dentin has been removed (Figure 2).

Dentists and their patients also want to avoid the considerable costs of endodontic treatment and fixed or implant prosthodontics should non-restorative management of a “hidden” lesion be unsuccessful. There have been reports that patients prefer to have restorative intervention rather than employ more conservative measures.⁹ However it is far from clear that long-term studies will prove the effectiveness of such interventions, although some studies show considerable promise.¹⁷ Practitioners still lack comprehensive information as to the long-term effectiveness of adhesive preventive resin restorative treatment.

CLINICAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Practicing dentists have an advantage over epidemiologists in that they obtain immediate false-positive feedback when they instrument a tooth with no clinical caries and false-negative feedback when a recall patient exhibits progression of an equivocal lesion. Dentists should be encouraged to use this feedback as part of their diagnostic procedure and explain to their patients the difficulty of providing an accurate and precise diagnosis with existing tests. A rational approach to caries diagnosis in the absence of reliable tests may be to treat the susceptible surfaces as a unit rather than a series of unrelated clinical observations. The dentist could evaluate the risk factors for a particular patient and then identify the most likely fissure to be carious. If the dentist then decides a surgical intervention is justified, he or she can use feedback from that procedure, particularly the extent or absence of caries, to determine if additional intervention is indicated (Figure 3). Support for this contract may be found in studies that identify “examiner prediction of future caries activity” as a significant predictor of caries risk.¹⁸

FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

The recommendations of the RTI review for future research directions provide useful guidance for researchers seeking to advance the knowledge of caries diagnosis. For in vivo work they recommend a standardization for histological validation methods for carious lesions. They also recommend a standard format for the reporting of clinical caries diagnosis trials. However, these recommendations do not overcome some of the problems inherent to in vivo studies of permanent teeth, particularly the requirement for extraction subsequent to the test. Information is obtained on a daily basis by dental practitioners when they determine the extent of suspicious lesions through operative intervention and when they recall patients previously deemed to not require operative intervention. Careful, well-designed, sampling of the outcomes of these procedures could be an important source for providing helpful clinical guidance.

REFERENCES

1. Stookey GK, Jackson RD, Zandona AFG, Analoui M. Dental caries diagnosis. *Dent Clin North Am* 1999;43:665-77.
2. Alfano RR, Yao SS. Human teeth with and without dental caries studied by visible luminescent spectroscopy. *J Dent Res* 1981;60:120-2.
3. Fishman J. Families a stoplight for tooth decay. *US News and World Report* 2000; October.
4. Lussie A, Hotz P, Stich H. Fissure caries. Their diagnosis and therapeutic principles. (In German) *Schweiz Monatsschr Zahnmed* 1995;105:1164-73.
5. Miller PA, Ismail AI, MacInnis WA. Restorative management of carious pits and fissures: A new approach. *J Dent Res* 1995;74:248 (Abstract).
6. Lussi A. Clinical performance of the laser fluorescence system Diagnodent for detection of occlusal caries (In German). *Acta Med Dent Helv* 2000;5:15-9.
7. Basting RT, Serra MC. Occlusal caries: Diagnosis and noninvasive treatments. *Quintessence Int* 1999;30:174-8.
8. Kidd EA, Ricketts DN, Pitts NB. Occlusal caries diagnosis: a changing challenge for clinicians and epidemiologists. *J Dent* 1993;21:323-31.
9. Clinical Research Associates. Newsletter. 1999;23(12):2.
10. Rosenstiel SF, Rashid RG. Visual assessment of occlusal caries: a web-based dentists' survey. *J Dent Res* 2000;80:229 (Abstract).

11. Nyttun RB, Raadal, Espelid I. Diagnosis of dentin involvement in occlusal caries based on visual and radiographic examination of the teeth. *Scand J Dent Res* 1992;1000:144-8.
12. Stookey GK, Jackson RD, Zadona AG, Analoui M. Dental caries diagnosis. *Dent Clin North Am* 1999;43:665-77.
13. Goldstein RE, Parkins FM. Using air-abrasive technology to diagnose and restore pit and fissure caries. *J Am Dent Assoc* 1995;126:761-6.
14. Ripa LW, Wolff MS. Preventive resin restorations: indications, technique, and success. *Quintessence Int* 1992;23:307-15.
15. Hamilton J. Microdentistry: the new standard of care: Part 3. Is air abrasion safe? *CDS Rev* 1999;(Sep):16-22.
16. Freedman G, Goldstep F, Seif T. Ultraconservative resin restorations. "Watch and wait?" is not acceptable treatment. *Dent Today* 2000;19(1):66-71.
17. Mertz-Fairhurst EJ, Curtis JW Jr, Ergle JW, Rueggeberg FA, Rueggeberg FA, Adair SM. Ultraconservative and cariostatic sealed restorations: results at year 10. *J Am Dent Assoc* 1998;129:55-66.
18. Disney JA, Stamm JW, Graves RC, Abernathy JR, Bohannon HW, Zack DD. Description and preliminary results of a caries risk assessment model. In: Bader JD, ed. *Risk assessment in dentistry*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, Dental Ecology, 1990:204-14.

Table 1.

Comparison of over treatment with under treatment of stained occlusal fissures in permanent teeth.

	“Over treatment” with preventive resin restoration.	“Under treatment” with remineralization strategies and watchful waiting.
Immediate Advantages	Increased knowledge of caries extent. Claimed patient preference. Additional fee to dentist.*	No restorative intervention needed. Lower cost to patient.
Immediate Disadvantages	Additional clinical procedure. Additional payment by patient and/or 3 rd party.	Uncertainty of caries extent. Variability of patient response No fee.*
Long Term Advantages	Reduced likelihood of extensive carious lesions developing.	Reduced number of restorations requiring evaluation, maintenance and replacement. Emphasis on prevention may reduce progress of other lesions.
Long Term Disadvantages	Average lifetime of restorations is unknown. No well-developed guidelines for the replacement of suspicious preventive resin restorations.	Increased likelihood of extensive carious lesions requiring endodontic treatment. Strategy may require more frequent recall.

* with most current US civilian dental practice reimbursement methods.